

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/769,157	01/29/2004	Joshua D. Rabinowitz	00037.09CON	7775	
37485	7590 12/09/2004		EXAN	EXAMINER	
ALEXZA MOLECULAR DELIVERY CORPORATION 1001 EAST MEADOW CIRCLE			HAGHIGHA	HAGHIGHATIAN, MINA	
PALO ALTO			ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1616		

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/769,157	RABINOWITZ ET AL.				
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mina Haghighatian	1616				
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTO THE MAILING DATE OF T - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may - If the period for reply specified abo - If NO period for reply is specified a - Failure to reply within the set or existence.	"HIS COMMUNICATION. e under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 illing date of this communication. ve is less than thirty (30) days, a reply oove, the maximum statutory period w ended period for reply will, by statute, er than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED date of this communication, even if timely filed,	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. & 133).				
Status			,				
1) Responsive to comm	nunication(s) filed on 24 Se	ptember 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL		action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims			•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are	pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/ard	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are s	subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers							
Applicant may not requ	on <u>29 January 2004</u> is/are: est that any objection to the d	. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119)						
a) All b) Some * c 1. Certified copie 2. Certified copie 3. Copies of the c application from	c) None of: s of the priority documents s of the priority documents certified copies of the priori n the International Bureau	have been received in Application ty documents have been received	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	2 200	" .					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statemer Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/24/04.	nt(s) (PTÖ-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/769,157

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,737,043 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims are either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claims. Here claims 1-28 are generic to all that is recited in claims of U.S. Patent No. 6, 737,043 B2. That is, claims of U.S. Patent No. 6, 737,043 B2 fall entirely within the scope of claims 1-28, or in other words, claims 1-28 are anticipated by claims of U.S. Patent No. 6, 737,043 B2. Specifically, the compositions and method of producing the formulations as recited in instant claims 1-28 are anticipated by the compositions and method of producing the compositions as recited in claims of U.S. Patent No. 6, 737,043 B2. The rate of formation of aerosol particles is disclosed in the specification of the U.S. Patent No. 6, 737,043.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,157

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-19 of copending Application No. 10/735,495. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims are either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claims. Here claims 1-16 are generic to all that is recited in claims of copending Application No. 10/735,495. That is, claims of copending Application No. 10/735,495 fall entirely within the scope of claims 1-16, or in other words, claims 1-16 are anticipated by claims of copending Application No. 10/735,495. Specifically, the compositions recited in instant claims 1-16 are anticipated by the method of administering and the kit comprising a composition and a device for delivering the drug aerosol of copending Application No. 10/735,495 (claims 10-19).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mina Haghighatian whose telephone number is 571-272-0615. The examiner can normally be reached on core office hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary L. Kunz can be reached on 571-272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,157

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mina Haghighatian December 02, 2004

MICHAEL G. HARTLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER